DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 754 HE 003 805

AUTHOR	Eberle, August W.; Thompson, Robert E.
TITLE	Sabbatical Leaves in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Student Association of Higher Education, Bloomington, Ind.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	24p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Student Association for Higher Education, Education 319, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47041 ($1.00 prepaid)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	College Teachers; *Higher Education; *Leave of Absence; Professional Education; Professors; *Sabbatical Leaves; *Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Welfare

ABSTRACT

This document presents a status report of various sabbatical leave policies and plans at 386 higher education institutions across the U.S. The report provides information that can serve as a guide for institutions that do not presently provide sabbatical leaves of absence or that can be compared with existing sabbatical leave plans. It was found that: (1) approximately two thirds of all respondents grant sabbatical leaves; (2) administrators are more likely to be eligible for sabbatical leaves in public institutions than in nonpublic ones; (3) tenure is a required condition to receive sabbatical leaves in about 60% of the institutions; (4) about 3 out of 5 senior level institutions indicated that professorial ranks are the only ranks eligible; (5) an average of slightly more than 6 years of service is required before a sabbatical leave may be taken; and (6) sabbatical leaves are considered a significant facet of the professional growth of faculty members and administrators. (HS)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 072174

Sabbatical Leaves In Higher Education

by AUGUST W. EBERLE
and
ROBERT E. THOMPSON

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 003 805

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert E Thompson
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

STUDENT ASSOCIATION of HIGHER EDUCATION
INDIANA UNIVERSITY · BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA · 1973

ED 072754

SABBATICAL LEAVES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by

August W. Eberle and Robert E. Thompson

Published By

Student Association of Higher Education, Indiana University

Bloomington, Indiana

1972

HE 00 3 805

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

August W. Eberle is professor and chairman, Department of Higher Education, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Robert E. Thompson is assistant to the vice president for public affairs, Indiana State University, Terre Haute.

Copyright
Robert E. Thompson
1973

ORDERING THE REPORT

This report is available postpaid for $1.00 in cash, check, or money order paid in advance. If a billing process is required, the price is $1.50. Order from Student Association for Higher Education, Education 319, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47041, and make checks payable to Student Association for Higher Education (SAHE).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 5

General findings and conclusions 5

Population and procedures 6

Enrollment, control, and availability of leaves 6

All respondents 6

Junior colleges 8

Public senior institutions 8

Nonpublic senior institutions 9

Eligibility of administrators for sabbatical leaves and relationship to academic rank 11

Junior colleges 11

Senior institutions 11

Public senior institutions 12

Nonpublic senior institutions 12

Replacement of persons on leave 13

Tenure as a requirement for sabbatical leaves 15

Eligibility for leaves related to faculty rank 15

Years of service required for eligibility for leave 16

Percent allowed on leave at one time 17

Compensation while on leave 17

Other paid employment while on paid sabbatical leave 18

Conditions for receiving sabbatical leaves 18

Obligation to return 19

Decision making processes for granting leaves 19

The future of sabbatical leaves 20

Conclusions 22

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Availability of sabbatical leaves in responding institutions by enrollment categories in numbers and percentages 7

Table 2. Availability of sabbatical leaves in junior colleges by size categories in numbers and percentages 8

Table 3. Availability of sabbatical leaves in public senior institutions by size categories in numbers and percentages 9

Table 4. Availability of sabbatical leaves in nonpublic senior institutions by enrollment categories in numbers and percentages . . 10

Table 5. Tenure as a requirement for sabbatical leaves, by types of institutions in numbers and percentages 15

INTRODUCTION

Of the many and varied fringe benefits a college or university offers its faculty and administrators, sabbatical leaves seem to be of top priority. A sabbatical leave is considered to be one of the most valuable means by which a faculty member's effectiveness may be enhanced. It is also considered to be of value to the institution because of the new strength that will be gained as a result of the leave. However, this report is purely a status report of various sabbatical leave policies and plans, and it does not deal with the values which actually accrue from sabbatical leaves.

This report of the sabbatical leave practices of 386 institutions of higher education hopefully provides information that can serve as a guide for institutions which do not presently provide sabbatical leaves of absence and will also provide information which can be compared with existing sabbatical leave plans.

GENERAL FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Little research and literature regarding sabbatical leaves was found. Approximately two thirds of all respondents did grant sabbatical leaves. Administrators were more likely to be eligible for sabbatical leaves in public institutions than in nonpublic ones. Tenure was a required condition to receive sabbatical leaves in approximately 60 percent of the institutions. Approximately three out of five of senior level institutions indicated that professorial ranks were the only ranks eligible. Overall, an average of slightly more than six years of service was required before a sabbatical leave might be taken. More than one half of all leave-granting respondents indicated faculty members might accept other paid employment during sabbatical leaves. There were many and varied conditions for receiving sabbatical leaves. Sabbatical

leaves were considered a significant facet of the professional growth of faculty members and administrators.

Sabbatical leaves have been an important part of the picture of higher education in the United States for a least three fourths of a century, but their importance seems lessened by the large proportion of institutions which have not granted them. They seem related to institutional age and to tradition in higher education, and their availability appears to fluctuate in terms of faculty supply and demand and institutional finances.

POPULATION AND PROCEDURES

A random sample consisting of 350 senior institutions in the United States was drawn, as was one of 150 junior colleges. Questionnaires were mailed to chief academic officers on February 9, 1972. By March 10, without any follow up procedures, 77 percent of the 500 instruments had been returned for a total of 386 responses. Of these, 246 were from senior institutions and 140 were from junior colleges. Thus with 36 percent of the total responses from junior colleges, which group included only 30 percent of the original mailing, and 64 percent from senior colleges, it is obvious that the junior colleges responded better (93%) than did the senior colleges (70%). However, these varied proportions of responses were not considered important in presenting data since the presentation has been done in a manner to enable readers to be selective in interpretation.

ENROLLMENTS, CONTROL, AND AVAILABILITY OF LEAVES

Table 1 reveals for all respondents the availability of sabbatical leaves by sizes of institutions (enrollment categories) and shows numbers of institutions

in each size category in addition to percentages of those granting leaves both for the total group and for each size category.

TABLE 1. AVAILABILITY OF SABBATICAL LEAVES IN RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS BY ENROLLMENT CATEGORIES IN NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Enrollment categories	Leaves granted			Leaves not granted			Totals	
	No.	% group	% total	No.	% group	% total	No.	Percent
1,000 & under	51	48	21	55	52	40	106	100
1,001-4,000	91	65	37	48	35	35	139	100
4,001-10,000	58	75	23	19	25	14	77	100
10,001-20,000	35	73	14	13	27	9	48	100
Above 20,000	13	81	5	3	19	2	16	100
Totals	248	64	100	138	36	100	386	100

The data in Table 1 show that 64 percent of all institutions responding granted sabbatical leaves and that the proportions of those granting leaves rose steadily as enrollments increased, from 48 percent for the under 1,000 group to 81 percent for the over 20,000 group. The exception was in the 10,001 to 20,000 group where the percentage granting leaves dropped slightly from that in the next smaller institution group. A slight majority of all institutions under 1,000 did not provide sabbatical leaves, but substantial majorities of all other groups offered such leaves.

Junior colleges. In Table 2 is reported the availability of sabbatical leaves in junior colleges by size categories in numbers and percentages of each size group and the total group.

TABLE 2. AVAILABILITY OF SABBATICAL LEAVES IN JUNIOR COLLEGES BY SIZE CATEGORIES IN NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Enrollment categories	Leaves granted			Leaves not granted			Totals	
	No.	% group	% total	No.	% group	% total	No.	Percent
1,000 & under	19	37	22	33	63	61	52	100
1,001-4,000	34	64	40	19	36	35	53	100
4,001-10,000	22	92	26	2	8	4	24	100
10,001-20,000	9	100	10	0	0	0	9	100
Above 20,000	2	100	2	0	0	0	2	100
Totals	86	61	100	54	39	100	140	100

The data in Table 2 show that 61 percent of 140 junior colleges responding granted sabbatical leaves. Only 37 percent in the under 1,000 category did so, but in the remaining size categories the pattern of responses was similar to that for the total group, with the three largest categories, two of which were very small in total numbers, awarding leaves in larger proportions than was true for the total group.

Public senior institutions. Table 3 presents the same type of information as Table 2 except that it is for public senior institutions.

TABLE 3. AVAILABILITY OF SABBATICAL LEAVES IN PUBLIC SENIOR INSTITUTIONS BY SIZE CATEGORIES IN NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Enrollment categories	Leaves granted			Leaves not granted			Totals	
	No.	% group	% total	No.	% group	% total	No.	Percent
1,000 & under	1	33	1	2	67	5	3	100
1,001-4,000	17	57	24	13	43	34	30	100
4,001-10,000	24	67	34	12	33	32	36	100
10,001-20,000	19	74	27	8	26	21	27	100
Above 20,000	10	77	14	3	23	8	13	100
Totals	71	65	100	38	35	100	109	100

These data tell a story by now somewhat familiar in that only one third of institutions of 1,000 or less offered sabbatical leaves (but the total here is miniscule.) The rising proportions offering sabbatical leaves as enrollments increased appears here again, but in general the proportions are not as large as for the total group, as was shown in Table 1, or for the junior colleges, as was shown in Table 2. Thus, the nature of what is to be expected in a report on the sabbatical leave situation in nonpublic senior institutions can readily be estimated in advance and fulfills one of the conclusions noted earlier concerning age and tradition.

Nonpublic senior institutions. Table 4 includes the same type of information for nonpublic senior institutions as was shown in Tables 2 and 3 for junior colleges and public senior institutions, respectively.

TABLE 4. AVAILABILITY OF SABBATICAL LEAVES IN NONPUBLIC SENIOR INSTITUTIONS BY ENROLLMENT CATEGORIES IN NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Enrollment categories	Leaves granted			Leaves not granted			Totals	
	No.	% group	% total	No.	% group	% total	No.	Percent
1,000 & under	31	61	34	20	39	43	51	100
1,001-4,000	40	71	44	16	29	35	56	100
4,001-10,000	12	71	13	5	29	11	17	100
10,001-20,000	7	58	8	5	42	11	12	100
Above 20,000	1	100	1	0	0	0	1	100
Totals	91	66	100	46	34	100	137	100

The information revealed in Table 4 shows, as was expected, that nonpublic senior institutions offered sabbatical leaves more often than did junior and public senior institutions. The differences show up most strongly in the smaller enrollment categories where there are strong pro-sabbatical majorities in both the 1,000 and under and 1,001 to 4,000 groups. In other words size was not as strong a factor in the provision of sabbatical leaves in nonpublic senior institutions as it was in the other two categories or as it was when all were put together in the total group. The drop to 58 percent in the 10,001 to 20,000 category needs no explanation since the number in this group is so small.

ELIGIBILITY OF ADMINISTRATORS FOR SABBATICAL LEAVES AND RELATIONSHIP TO ACADEMIC RANK

A question which was increasingly raised during the 1960's was whether administrators should have sabbatical leaves. Some have even proposed seven year terms for presidents. Therefore, the instrument included a question about the eligibility for sabbatical leaves of administrators, and, if they were eligible, the next logical question was asked, i.e., whether eligibility depended on faculty rank.

Junior colleges. As it turned out, of the 86 junior colleges which made sabbatical leaves available, only 66 made them available to administrators and, of these 66, 47 did not have faculty ranks. Therefore, except to report that 74 percent of the junior colleges with sabbatical leaves made them available to administrators and that these 66 were only 47 percent of all 140 junior colleges responding, little more needs to be reported about administrators and sabbatical leaves in junior colleges. However, the investigators did analyze junior college responses in this case as to whether there were differences between public and private institutions and found that four fifths of the responding public junior colleges which offered sabbatical leaves did make them available to administrators, whereas nonpublic junior colleges were almost evenly divided in this regard. This information is contrary to what was revealed earlier with regard to general availability of sabbatical leaves in public and private senior colleges but does give a hint of what is to come with regard to sabbatical leaves for administrators in public and private senior institutions.

Senior institutions. Administrators were shown to have sabbatical leaves available in 108, or 67 percent, of the 162 senior institutions which had sabbatical leave plans. Another way of reporting the data is to note that 108, or

44 percent, of all 246 responding senior institutions granted sabbatical leaves to administrators. Of the 108 senior institutions allowing administrators sabbatical leaves 77 required that the administrators hold academic rank. Another way of describing this situation is to report that more than three fifths of all senior institutions have sabbatical leave plans, that of those with such plans two thirds make them available to administrators and that more than two thirds of those making leaves available to administrators require that the administrators hold academic rank. In still other words, in only 31 out of 246 senior institutions could administrators get sabbatical leaves without also, in a sense, being members of the faculty.

Since important differences were shown to exist between public and nonpublic senior institutions in making sabbatical leaves available, it seemed appropriate to examine the same categories with regard to administrative sabbatical leaves and their relationship to academic rank.

Public senior institutions. Public senior institutions, of which 71 out of 109 (65%) had reported sabbatical leave plans, allowed administrators to have sabbatical leaves in 55 cases. These 55 institutions are 77 percent of the 71 granting leaves and 50 percent of all reporting public senior institutions. Of these 55 institutions 37 required academic rank as a part of eligibility for sabbatical leaves. Thus, again, only 18 of all 109 public senior institutions responding allowed administrators sabbatical leaves unless they were also "of the faculty."

Nonpublic senior institutions. Of nonpublic senior institutions only 53 of the 91 with sabbatical leave plans (and of the 137 nonpublic senior institutions responding) allowed administrators to have sabbatical leaves. These 53 are 58 percent of senior nonpublic sabbatical leave institutions and

only 38 percent of all such responding institutions. Of these 53 colleges and universities 41 required academic rank of administrators seeking sabbatical leaves. Thus, in the final analysis, only 12 of all 137 senior nonpublic institutions responding allowed administrators sabbatical leaves without their also being faculty members.

REPLACEMENT OF PERSONS ON LEAVES

One of the most important concerns one might expect about sabbatical leave plans would be their cost to the institutions having them. A prime item of cost is the replacement of personnel on leave. For all practical purposes, if a plan can be handled in such a manner that replacement of an individual on leave need not be done, the cost of the plan can be minimized. Therefore, the survey instrument included a question on this subject. The data from the responses to this question are handled here as with previous queries: (1) for all respondents, (2) for junior colleges, (3) for public senior institutions, and (4) for nonpublic senior institutions. The question gave three choices, i.e., (1) a replacement is not employed but duties are spread among other staff members, (2) a replacement is employed, and (3) a combination of (1) and (2).

For all 248 institutions responding that they had sabbatical leaves 37 stated that duties were spread among other staff members, 101 indicated that replacements were employed, and 107 reported a combination of these processes. There is little surprising in these responses since few institutions would be able to spread duties among other staff members in all cases, and one would expect some relationship between response and size of institution. Perhaps the most surprising item is that as many as 37 could state unequivocally that they spread duties among other staff members.

Among junior colleges only five public and one nonpublic stated that other staff members fulfilled the duties of the one on leave. Fifty public and eight nonpublic junior colleges reported that a replacement was employed for each staff member on leave, and 20 and 2, respectively, indicated a combination process. Thus for junior colleges, public or nonpublic, the strong majority used the replacement process. In this regard it may be relevant to note that 62 percent (see Table 2) of all junior colleges responding that they granted sabbatical leaves were 4,000 or under in size; almost one fourth were 1,000 or under. One would logically expect size to influence the ability to have duties shared instead of employing replacements.

Among public senior colleges and universities, the total reporting leave plans for this study being 71, 16 (22%) used the tactic of spreading duties to others, 24 (34%) employed replacements, and 29 (41%) did whichever was necessary or feasible. Two (3%) did not respond. The comparable figures for nonpublic institutions (91 offering sabbaticals) were 15 (16%), 19 (21%), and 56 (62%). One (1%) did not respond to this question. Thus, it can be seen that the combination process was the popular one for senior colleges. Slightly more than 50 percent used the third procedure as compared with two thirds or more of junior colleges using the replacement process. The nonpublic senior institutions went strongest for the replacement process when compared with public senior institutions.

Among other responses to the question were the following which seem useful to repeat here. One institution stated that the course of action depended on the size of the department. A second reported that a leave of six months or less was taken care of by having others fulfill the duties but that a leave of more than six months involved getting a replacement. A third response, offered by three institutions, was that a faculty member on leave was replaced but an administrator on leave was not replaced.

TENURE AS A REQUIREMENT FOR SABBATICAL LEAVES

The strong relationship described earlier between sabbatical leaves and academic rank leads also to the question of the relationship of sabbatical leaves to tenure status. Table 5 shows the responses for all types of institutions considered but does not deal with the size factor.

TABLE 5. TENURE AS A REQUIREMENT FOR SABBATICAL LEAVES, BY TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS IN NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

Institutional types	Required		Not required		No response		Totals	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Public jr.	51	68	22	29	2	3	75	100
Nonpublic jr.	6	54	5	46	0	0	11	100
Public sr.	40	56	31	44	0	0	71	100
Nonpublic sr.	50	55	40	44	1	1	91	100
Totals	147	59	98	40	3	1	248	100

These data show clearly that a small majority of all types of institutions required tenure before granting sabbatical leaves but that the requirement in public junior colleges was a strong one.

ELIGIBILITY FOR LEAVES RELATED TO FACULTY RANK

After having considered tenure as a factor in leave-granting, the question about academic rank naturally arises. Therefore, a question of this nature was asked.

It was reported earlier that the majority of responding junior colleges did not have faculty ranks. Therefore, a question about academic rank and sabbatical leaves in junior colleges seemed scarcely relevant. Only 10 out of the 86 offering sabbatical leaves reported limiting them to professorial ranks.

The public senior colleges which gave sabbatical leaves (71 out of 109 responding) tended to favor professorial ranks with 42 institutions (59%) in this category. However, obviously, the 41 percent making them available to all ranks was a strong minority.

The responses from nonpublic senior colleges were similar to those of the public ones with 55 (60%) of the 91 granting sabbatical leaves limiting such leaves to professorial ranks.

YEARS OF SERVICE REQUIRED FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR LEAVE

A sabbatical leave is usually thought of to be a leave available during the seventh year of service or after six years are completed. The responses about this situation are reported by ranges and averages.

Public junior colleges had a range of one to eight years of prior service with an average of 5.76 years. Nonpublic junior colleges reported a range of three to eight years with a mean of 5.63 years. Public senior institutions indicated a range of two to ten years with an average of 6.15 years. Finally, nonpublic senior institutions showed a range of three to eleven years with a mean of 6.42 years. In general, it seems fair to report that the sabbatical leave tends, indeed, to be a seventh year leave but that a good many institutions do not necessarily adhere to the ancient meaning of "sabbatical."

PERCENT ALLOWED ON LEAVE AT ONE TIME

An important question concerning the financing of sabbatical leaves, especially when replacements are required, relates to the proportion of the faculty that is allowed to be on leave at any one time. A few institutions, a total of 12, reported no policy in this regard, having undoubtedly learned that all of those available never request leaves and that, therefore, no regulation seemed needed.

The report on the remainder again is reported by ranges and averages. Public junior colleges reported a range of one to ten percent with a mean of 3.92 percent. Nonpublic junior colleges reported a range of one to six percent with an average of four percent. Public senior institutions provided a range of two to ten percent with an average of 6.15 percent. Finally, nonpublic senior institutions showed a range of three to ten percent with a mean of 6.42 percent.

COMPENSATION WHILE ON LEAVE

Nineteen different responses, including no responses, were received to the question of the rate or amount of compensation while on leave. However, the following proportions in the four types of institutions reported what was thought to be traditional, i.e., half pay for two semesters or full pay for one semester: public junior, 63 percent; nonpublic junior, 64 percent; public senior, 65 percent; and nonpublic senior, 82 percent. The predominance of this "typical" condition was enhanced by responses from eight public senior institutions, or 11 percent of those in this category, showing variations of the full pay for one semester or half pay for two semesters adapted to the quarter system. In all eight of these cases full salary was available for one quarter at least.

A total of eight institutions, spread across the four categories, followed the generous practice of paying full salary for the academic year.

Public junior colleges showed the widest range of possibilities with 11 kinds of formulas presented.

OTHER PAID EMPLOYMENT WHILE ON PAID SABBATICAL LEAVE

If one receives salary during a leave, the question naturally arises about whether he should be allowed to accept paid employment during the leave. Seventeen leave-granting institutions did not respond to this question, but of the remaining 231 a surprising proportion (121, or 52%) indicated that they permitted gainful employment during paid leave periods. Interestingly, such permission was more readily available among public senior institutions than among nonpublic senior institutions by a slight margin and much more so in senior institutions in general than in junior colleges.

CONDITIONS FOR RECEIVING SABBATICAL LEAVES

What conditions must one fulfill in order to receive a sabbatical leave, assuming that the required number of years of service has been fulfilled? In the attempt to learn about such conditions, six kinds of responses were provided: plan for teaching improvement, travel plan, writing plan, research plan, no requirements, and other.

The variety of plans used was great, the most popular being any or all of the first four mentioned plus health reasons. Next most popular was a plan for teaching improvement, but this one would have been much further down the list if it had not been for the public junior colleges. The third most popular plan was

that of research, and after this one came travel, writing, and "either teaching, writing, or research," respectively. Only 14 institutions reported no requirements.

The availability of a sabbatical leave to pursue an advanced degree was not included in the "conditions" question reported above but was asked as a separate question. Ten institutions did not respond to this question. Almost 80 percent of the remaining 238 institutions reported that to pursue an advanced degree was a satisfactory reason for granting a sabbatical leave. Such favorability was much more pronounced in junior colleges than in senior institutions but strong majorities favoring this plan were found in senior institutions also: two thirds of the public and three fourths of the nonpublic.

OBLIGATION TO RETURN

If one goes on leave on full or part salary it seems logical that some sort of condition about returning be imposed, and such was found to be the case in 218 of 242 (91%) of the institutions responding to this question. Only the nonpublic senior institutions dropped below the 90 percent mark in this regard, but they were still there with a strong 81 percent.

DECISION MAKING PROCESS FOR GRANTING LEAVES

In an attempt to ascertain the various processes used and the administrators involved in making decisions about whether leaves are granted, a question about this was asked with the following possible answers: (1) direct request to president, (2) direct request to chief academic officer, subsequently approved by higher authority, (3) direct request to department chairman, subsequently approved by higher authority, and (4) other (please explain.)

The responses appeared to be related to institutional size, assuming that junior colleges were most likely to be the smaller institutions, the nonpublic institutions next in size, and the public senior institutions largest. Among junior colleges 60 percent of those granting sabbatical leaves stated that the process would be initiated by direct request to either the chief academic officer or the president. Among nonpublic senior institutions, 46 percent followed the same procedures, but among senior public institutions only 20 percent followed one or the other of these two procedures. Among this latter group 69 percent followed the procedure of a direct request to the department chairman. The department chairman process was common enough among all types of institutions that it was most popular, with 40 percent. Direct request to chief academic officer was next most popular, with 28 percent, and direct request to president third, with 15 percent. Amazingly, only 14 percent reported using the sabbatical leave committee approach and more public junior colleges, both in number and percent, stated that they utilized this approach than did any other type. In this regard, nonpublic senior institutions were second. Considering developments of recent years, it may be safe to guess that a study done a few years hence may show considerable growth in the committee approach. However, it must be considered that a question of this type is difficult to phrase in such a manner that one can be certain that the responses reflect accurately the total process.

THE FUTURE OF SABBATICAL LEAVES

As was indicated early in the present report, there is evidence that the prevalence and nature of sabbatical leaves may vary in accordance with faculty supply and demand and with availability of finances. Therefore, it was thought desirable to ask about whether responding institutions planned to continue

sabbatical leaves, the degree to which respondents (chief academic officers) considered them important, and whether they were more important for faculty or for administrators. One question which, in retrospect, should have been asked in this regard is whether sabbatical leaves were considered of more importance to the institution or to the person receiving the leave, but the question was not asked.

More than 95 percent of all respondents with sabbatical leave plans and of institutions in each group who responded to the question about continuation of sabbatical leaves responded in the affirmative.

Two thirds of all respondents stated that sabbatical leaves were of substantial importance, 30 percent of moderate importance, and only four percent of questionable importance. The junior and senior institutions tended to oppose each other on these items with senior institutions strongly voting "substantial" and junior colleges much less so. Junior colleges outranked the senior institutions in voting "moderate." Finally, seven out of the ten voting "questionable" were junior colleges. No nonpublic senior institution was in the "questionable" column.

All responding institutions offering sabbatical leaves split almost evenly on the question of to whom leaves were most important with 48 percent nodding toward the faculty and 52 percent giving the nod to "equally important for faculty and administration." Only one respondent said they were of more importance to administrators! However, in senior institutions there was a modest majority for the faculty (57%), whereas in junior colleges the clear majority (69%) stated that sabbatical leaves were as important for administrators as for faculty.

CONCLUSIONS

Sabbatical leaves have been an important part of the picture of higher education in the United States for at least three fourths of a century, but their importance seems questioned to the degree that one third of all institutions seem not to grant them.

Since nonpublic institutions tend to be older than do public institutions it seems fair to state that the granting of sabbatical leaves is related positively to age and tradition in higher education.

There is some evidence that the availability of sabbatical leaves fluctuates in accordance with supply of and demand for faculty members and with financial circumstances. There also appears to be a lack of evidence that the values often claimed for sabbatical leaves are actually realized or, at least, that they are evident. Thus, it seems possible that sabbatical leaves benefit faculty members taking them more than the institutions granting them. There was little evidence shown by the data collected in the present study that requirements for sabbatical leaves emphasized institutional improvement more than faculty perquisites. Thus the sabbatical leave may be in reality a form of faculty compensation.

While the following are more recommendations than conclusions, it seems important to report them as conclusions in order to emphasize their importance.

1. Another status study of sabbatical leaves should be carried out in five to seven years in order to gain more perspective concerning the fluctuating nature of their availability as referred to in the conclusion stated immediately above.
2. Studies of the values resulting from sabbatical leaves and whether they accrue more to faculty than to institutions, or vice versa, are vital before wise adjustments can be made in sabbatical leave policies and plans. Such

studies should include investigations of the question whether all faculty members eligible to apply for leaves should not be required either to apply or to give reasons for not applying, especially if it is thought that sabbatical leaves benefit institutions more than or equally as much as faculty members on leave.

Public junior colleges have moved rapidly to adopt the traditional sabbatical leave concept of higher education despite the often stated claim that public junior colleges tend more to be upper level secondary schools than higher education institutions. At the same time, it is recognized that the concept of sabbatical leaves has spread into elementary and secondary schools in recent years. Therefore, one may not now conclude with confidence whether the community college is denying its secondary forebears and adopting more traditionally oriented college characteristics or, if it is doing so, whether the movement is a desirable development.